



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,471	01/08/2001	Alasdair Campbell	800431	7317
27964	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES P.C. P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			CHOW, MING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	
DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/756,471	CAMPBELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ming Chow	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,16 and 38-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-22-05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) .
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 recites "said call processing" (line 4). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
2. Claim 2 recites "the network interface" (line 2). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
3. Claim 4 recites "the telephone network interface" (line 8). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 12 recites "the telephone network" and "the telephone network interface". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 13 recites "the telephone network". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claim 14 recites "the means for connecting voice client communications to the telephone network" and "the telephone network". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Election/Restrictions

7. Newly submitted claims 38-41 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 38-41 draws to flow control of data transmission through a network, classified in class 370 subclass 235.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 38-41 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Amendment

8. The reply filed on 4-15-05 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection as stated in the previous final Office action was not addressed. The Examiner repeats the same rejection below. The Examiner also waives the requirement of one-month response time for addressing the rejection, however, Applicant must address this rejection at the next response to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “the network” (line 3 and 4) is not clearly defined. It is unclear the claimed “the network” refers to “call processing network” or “global data communications network”.

10. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “Voice/Internet Protocol” is not clearly defined. It is unclear what is a Voice/Internet Protocol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

11. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goss (US: 6687241).

For claims 1, 11, Goss teaches on Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, a call processing network, item 42 Fig. 2 customer (claimed “voice client”), item 11a-11n call centers and item 31 Fig. 1 data center together reads on claimed “an agent”, item 20 PSTN (claimed “a network”). Goss teaches on item 140 Fig. 2, Firewall Server and items 134, 136, 118, 100, 130, 105 Fig. 2, claimed “workflow manager”. Goss teaches on item 32 Fig. 2, Internet (claimed “global data communications network”) which the claimed workflow manager connects to. Goss teaches on item 105 Fig 2, the workflow manager includes an IP router (reads on claimed “workflow manager for managing workflow”). Goss teaches on column 3 line 63-66 and item 100 Fig. 2, the “enterprise contact server” of the claimed “workflow manager” provides contact services to

Art Unit: 2645

customers (reads on claimed “workflow manager for servicing client requests”). Goss teaches on column 5 line 11-16, the enterprise contact server of the claimed “workflow manager” receives and routes (claimed “receiving and distributing”) customer’s contact requests (claimed “media events”) to agents.

Goss teaches on Fig. 2, connections to item 11a-11n multiple call centers are the claimed “means for connecting geographically distributed agent communications” in the call processing network.

Goss teaches on Fig. 2, connection to item 44 Fig. 2 (claimed “web client”) via internet in the call processing network. Goss teaches on column 3 line 63 to column 4 line 4, IP telephony application connected to the internet (reads on claimed “by voice”). Goss teaches on column 2 line 10-13 email, voice/video over IP (claimed “at least one other means....e-mail message”).

Regarding claim 2, Goss teaches on column 4 line 21-23 and item 12 Fig. 2 ACD (claimed “telephony switching apparatus”) connects to item 18 Fig. 2 CTI Server (claimed “telephony resource nodes”). Goss teaches on Fig. 2, CTI link (claimed “said telephony switching apparatus switch coupled to said telephony resource nodes”).

Regarding claim 4, for section (a), Goss teaches on items 134, 136, 118, 100, 130, 140 a cluster of servers connected to a LAN.

For section (b), Goss teaches on item 18 Fig. 2 CTI Server (claimed “telephony and real-time services server”).

For section (c), Goss teaches on item 12 ACD (claimed “telephony switching apparatus”) and item 18 CTI (claimed “telephony resource nodes”). Goss teaches on item 20 Fig. 2, PSTN (claimed “a voice communications network) which the claimed telephony switching apparatus and telephony resource nodes connect to.

For section (d), Goss teaches on item 140 Fig. 2 firewall server.

For section (e), Goss teaches on items 134, 136, 118, 100, 130, 105 Fig. 2 claimed “workflow management computer servers”.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 13, Goss teaches on column 4 line 21-26 ACD interfaces with PSTN via voice trunks. Goss teaches on Fig. 2 CTI (claimed “telephony resource nodes”) connects to PSTN, via ACD, by CTI link and trunks.

Regarding claim 8, Goss teaches on item 16 Fig. 2 VRU connects to CTI server.

Regarding claim 9, Goss teaches on item 16 Fig. 2 VRU (reads on claimed “playing recorded audio announcements to callers”).

Regarding claim 12, Goss teaches on Fig. 2 an ACD (claimed “telephony switching apparatus”) connects to telephone network. Interfaces for connecting agent communications to telephone network. Interfaces for connecting agent communications to the Internet.

Regarding claim 14, Goss teaches on item 46 telephone (reads on claimed “voice transmission means”).

Regarding claim 16, Goss teaches on item 32 Fig. 2 Internet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss et al, and in view of Lee et al (US: 6330327).

Goss failed to teach “the telephony.....trunk lines”. However, Lee et al teach on column 4 line 33-36, CTI interfaces with ACD by trunks.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Goss to have the “the telephony.....trunk lines” as taught by Lee et al such that the modified system of Goss would be able to support the trunk connections between switching apparatus and telephony resource nodes to the system users.

13. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss et al, and in view of Saito et al (US: 6707899).

Goss failed to teach “the telephony.....fault recovery”. However, Saito et al teach on column 7 line 46-52 CTI controls the state of the call.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Goss to have the “the telephony.....fault recovery” as taught by Saito et al such that the modified system of Goss would be able to support the state control to the system users.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant’s disclosure.

- Satyavolu et al (US: 6517587) teach networked architecture for enabling automated gathering information from web servers.

15. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7535. The examiner can normally

Art Unit: 2645

be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow

(M)



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600